



**2022 CDC AMENDMENTS WORKING GROUP MEETING
Draft Meeting Notes of February 23, 2022**

<u>Members:</u>	Council President Rory Bialostosky, Planning Commissioner Charlie Mathews, Planning Commissioner Scott Erwin, Planning Commissioner Carrie Pellett (Alternate), CCI Member Shannen Knight (EDC Alternate), HRB Member Tom Watton, EDC Member Shannon Ilas, TAB Member Greg DiLoreto, SAB Member Kim Bria, Member-at-large Darren Gusdorf, Member-at-large JJ Portlock, Member-at-large Jim Farrell.
<u>Members absent:</u>	CCI Member Vicki Olson (Alternate), Councilor Mary Baumgardner (Alternate) and CCI Member Dan Tedrow
<u>Staff present:</u>	Darren Wyss, Planning Manager and Lynn Schroder, Administrative Assistant
<u>Consultant present:</u>	Sou Garner and Alex Dupey, MIG Consultants

The meeting video is available [here](#).

1. Goals and Purpose of Working Group

Chair Farrell opened the meeting and asked members to list the different types of housing that they have lived in.

Planning Manager Wyss reviewed the goal and purpose of the Working Group. The West Linn City Council appointed a limited-duration Working Group to review and recommend three Code amendment projects currently underway. The 2022 Working Group will comment on the Code projects by reviewing, discussing, and revising the draft Code amendments.

Commissioner Erwin asked the Working Group to consider updating the meeting guidelines to allow discussion by appointed members with alternates participating only if the appointed member was not present. He stated that it was a matter of fairness as the Planning Commission has two appointed members and one alternate, and other committees only have a single appointed member. He was concerned that, with 12 appointed Committee members representing different CAGs, each member is given an equal opportunity to discuss the concepts and their perspectives. Chair Farrell objected. He said that everyone should be allowed to fully participate in the discussions, so no citizen of West Linn is cut out. Commissioner Mathews objected. He stated that alternate members should be able to participate so they can step in if the appointed member is absent. TAB Member DiLoreto agreed with Commissioner Erwin. He stated that nothing prevented an alternate from talking during the public comment period. Commissioner Erwin withdrew his request because he did not want to create contention within the group.

2. Meeting 1 Review

Commissioner Erwin noted a correction to the 1/26/22 minutes. Commissioner Pellett clarified her comments. Chair Farrell asked for any objections to the changes to the meeting notes. There were none.

Planning Manager Wyss recapped the first meeting. At the first meeting, the Working Group discussed the impact of current lot coverage and FAR requirements on smaller properties to support some of the middle

housing types. Councilor Bialostosky asked how some existing townhomes have exceeded the maximum FAR. Wyss responded that the current Code does not have a maximum FAR for multi-family housing.

Shannon Ilas clarified that the change in FAR would be available to both developed and undeveloped single-family lots.

3. HB2001 Code Package Discussion #1

Alex Dupey, MIG, discussed middle housing Code implementation concepts, including setbacks, lot coverage, and floor area ratio.

Staff has proposed increasing lot coverage and FAR maximums for zones with smaller lots. Sou Garner, MIG, summarized the proposed Code amendment recommendations:

- Remove maximum FAR and lot coverage requirements for townhouses and cottage clusters.
- In the R-5 and R4.5 Zones, remove maximum lot coverage requirements for duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes and increase FAR to 0.50 for duplexes, 0.55 for triplexes, and 0.6 for quadplexes.
- Increase the maximum FAR for a duplex to 0.7 in R-3 zones.
- Increase the maximum FAR for a duplex to 0.75 in the R2.1 zone.

Commissioner Erwin supported increasing the FAR in R10, R7, and R5 to allow more square footage to accommodate families. Dupey noted that many survey respondents wanted to downsize from larger houses as they age. Plexes provide diverse housing choices.

CCI Member Tedrow asked if the proposed changes would allow fence-line to fence-line development for cottage clusters. Dupey responded that FAR goes to mass and bulk. The lots would still need to meet setback requirements. Sou Garner commented that the OARs limit the maximum building footprint for cottage clusters is 900 square feet.

EDC Member Ilas asked if the effect of increasing FAR would create more crowded lots. She stated that survey respondents did not want over-crowded lots. Dupey responded that it would increase housing on a lot, but there would still be setback requirements. Ilas was concerned that increasing the FAR may benefit the builder more than the homeowner.

Commissioner Mathews was concerned about infill aesthetics with a mix of plex housing surrounded by larger houses. Mathews clarified that no changes to the FAR are proposed for R10 and R7. He asked what the community loses when the setbacks are reduced. Wyss clarified that proposed amendments would not reduce setbacks; instead would reduce the maximum lot coverage. Setbacks were put in place to allow fire response and yards.

Councilor Bialostosky shared Ilas's concern about over-crowded lots. He asked why the staff recommended the specific FAR changes. Wyss responded that the FAR was slightly increased in R5, R4.5, R3, and R2.1 to match the allowed square footage of the R10 and R7 rezone.

Commissioner Erwin was concerned that the proposal takes the smaller, denser areas of the City and makes them denser while leaving the larger lots as they are. He was also concerned that the proposal does not consider topography and curved roads. He was concerned that the proposed FAR does not encourage 2,000 square foot homes with yards that families seek out. He would support increasing the FAR in R7 and R10.

JJ Portlock noted that most jurisdictions do not use FAR; instead, they use maximum lot coverage and setbacks. He said FAR controls maximum square footage. He stated that the proposed FAR is arbitrary. He said that the Code should consider design. Portlock wanted to consider what kind of housing the City strives to achieve.

Commissioner Pellett would discourage any housing types more than duplexes on smaller lots. She wanted to achieve a more neighborhood feel. She thought that larger plexes should be on larger lots.

Sou Garner, MIG, clarified that the OAR allows all types of plexes on all existing single-family lots.

Councilor Bialostosky asked why the City has FAR requirements. He stated that FAR seems like an unnecessary requirement because of the requirements for maximum lot coverage and setbacks. Wyss stated that the City put in FARs in the 80ies to limit house size to eliminate tear down of smaller houses.

CCI Member Knight stated that increasing the FAR would result in more square footage and higher sale prices. She supported increasing FAR for townhomes.

Darren Gusdorf stated that if you take away FAR, you would have a box that you could build to maximum height, maximum lot coverage, and setbacks. The yard size would be reduced. He stated that builders would still need to meet consumer demand with design. The market is demanding aging-in-place and family homes. He did not think there was a market for 600 to 800 square foot homes for cost efficiencies and demand. He did not think it would be cost-efficient to tear down a \$900,000 large house and rebuild a triplex. He said that the plexes would be built on raw land.

JJ Portlock stated that he sees FAR requirements in communities seeking to limit tear down and replacement of small older homes. He stated the land expense and market efficiencies would limit the types of housing that builders would build in West Linn. He said the type of buyer that wants to buy in West Linn would also drive what is built.

Commissioner Erwin asked how houses could be built into the hillside to provide additional square footage.

4. Meeting 2 Agenda/Tasks

Planning Manager Wyss identified discussion topics for the next meeting:

- increasing FAR in R7 and R10
- changes to FAR in R5 and R4.5
- increasing density on small lots
- no lot coverage requirement in R5
- eliminating FAR for townhomes

Wyss wanted the Working Group to begin forming a consensus at the end of the next meeting. CCI Member Knight suggested that members get their questions and concerns to Wyss before the next meeting so that there is time to address them at the next meeting.

5. Public Comment

CJ Knoll commented on the current Code. He stated that proposed amendment package should include better definitions for the different plex housing types. He stated that, regardless of the requirements of HB2001, the City needs to address the need for parking going forward. The City should consider increasing

street width standards to provide on-street parking on each side of the road. The City should address intra-City transit to get people to TriMet hubs.

6. Adjourn

Chair Farrell adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.